DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 148 FL 016 046

AUTHOR Pakenham, Kenneth J.
TITLE Developing Expectations for Text in Adult Beginning ESL Readers.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 14p.; In: Handscombe, Jean, Ed.; And Others. On TESOL '83. The Question of Control. Selected Papers from the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (17th, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983); see FL 015 035.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Beginning Reading; Class Activities; Classroom Techniques; Context Clues; Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); *Expectation; Introductory Courses; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Instruction; Rhetoric; Second Language Instruction; *Syntax; *Vocabulary

ABSTRACT

Examination of the nature and role of expectations in reading suggests that both a reading skills and a language skills component are necessary in a program of reading instruction for adult beginning students of English as a second language (ESL). ESL students have found reading exercises specifically designed to teach syntax, vocabulary, and rhetoric and to encourage the formation and use of expectations to be meaningful and enjoyable learning activities. The syntax exercises help students develop the ability to orient themselves within a sentence by identifying the subject and main verb and to handle sentences with complex noun phrase subjects. The vocabulary exercises aid students in learning the lexicon and in forming expectations based on their vocabulary knowledge. These exercises include selecting words likely to appear in text on a given subject, and combining vocabulary knowledge with recognition of implicitly or explicitly logical connections between ideas. One exercise, combining vocabulary and rhetoric, seeks to teach specific vocabulary and to show students how they can expect an author to focus on one topic. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275148

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.
Frank-Merkel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Developing Expectations for Text in Adult Beginning ESL Readers

Kenneth J. Pakenham

BEGINNING READING MATERIALS IN ESL: THE PROBLEM

The past decade has seen a welcome increase in research in ESL reading. There has also been a concomitant growth in the number of published textbooks, for intermediate and advanced adult learners of ESL, which reflect an attempt to address in practice those issues which the theoretical literature has highlighted (Baudoin, Bober, Clarke, Dobson and Silberstein, 1977; Long, Allen, Cyr, Pomeroy, Ricard, Spada, and Vogel, 1980; Sonka, 1981; Dubin and Olshtain, 1981; Zukowski/Faust, Johnston, Atkinson, and Templin, 1982). These materials adopt what has been called a *reading skills approach* to the teaching of ESL reading. Such an approach views reading as a number of different purposeful activties involving the exercise of a number of different skills. The activities include skimming, scanning, extensive and intensive reading, and are clearly related to the purpose which readers have in mind when they sit down to a text. The skills include the ability to distinguish between main and supporting ideas, between fact and opinion, between the opinions of the writer and those of others cited, to understand implications, to follow the logical development of the text, to deal with ambiguities, to cope with unknown vocabulary, and a number of other abilities. Despite some weaknesses in the materials, some of which are discussed by Hamp-Lyons (1982), both they and the approach which they seek to implement are welcome developments in the general area of ESL reading.

The specific area of beginning ESL reading,[1] however, has not yet witnessed a similar attempt to apply relevant theoretical insights to the development of more adequate instructional materials. Here, with the exception of one textbook

Ken Pakenham, Director of the E.L.I. and Assistant Professor of English at the University of Akron, teaches classes in ESL reading, linguistics, and applied linguistics.

[1]For the purpose of this paper, it is assumed that students already know the Roman alphabet. The discussion of theory and applications is primarily directed towards the teaching of adults who are learning ESL for academic or professional reasons.

FL 016 046

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Connelly and Sims, 1982), what can be called the *word skills approach* to reading still holds sway. It is an approach which is typically represented by textbooks containing a variety of short texts, often syntactically and lexically controlled, with follow-up comprehension questions. After the reading and comprehension questions, the focus changes to exercises on vocabulary and word forms (derivational morphology) and to exercises of a word-level grammatical character, typically fill-in-the-blank exercises on the use of prepositions and articles.

From the preponderance of exercises focusing on words, it seems that the authors of such texts see the development of little more than lexical and morphological knowledge as the appropriate goal for reading instruction at the beginning level in ESL. While it is in the process of being supplanted by the reading skills approach at other levels of instruction, the word skills approach, therefore, seems in some sense to be still regarded as valid at the beginning level. I wish to argue here that a word-skills approach is inadequate even for beginning students and even if it is replaced by a reading-skills approach when the students reach an intermediate level of proficiency.

Four reasons can be suggested for the inadequacy of a word-skills approach. First, since the approach is based on an impoverished view of linguistic competence, concentrating on vocabulary, derivational morphology, article and preposition usage while almost completely ignoring syntax, it cannot hope to help students develop the rich linguistic competence which is ultimately necessary for efficient reading. Second, by ignoring reading skills and by not having students perform real reading tasks, the word skills approach may frustrate students who are good readers in their first languages and who expect to be the same in English.

A third and more general weakness of the word-skills approach is that it does not recognize the symbiotic nature of the relationship between language learning and reading in an intensive ESL program. Reading, as the discussion which follows will indicate, depends on linguistic knowledge. Yet one way to increase the pace of the acquisition of linquistic knowledge is to practice reading in English, as well as speaking it and listening to it. To the extent that acquiring a second language depends on being involved in meaningful communicative activities in that language, and to the extent that the word skills approach neglects reading for communication, it will offer little opportunity for real language learning to take place in the reading class.

The fourth and perhaps most important weakness of the word skills approach is that it may well foster or maintain the laborious and totally inefficient single word strategy which is an all too familiar and all too abiding characteristic of poor readers in ESL. Many of our students arrive in our classes burdened with unenlightened attitudes to reading, attitudes which are perhaps born of prior instructional experience. For them, for example, reading may only be reading aloud, or alternatively, merely a means to another linguistic end, such as vocabulary development or general language learning. So, through a neglect of reading skills combined with a preoccupation with language at the level of the single word, we in fact may be contributing to the development or maintenance of the very reading strategy which we wish to preempt or dismantle.

In spite of these manifest weaknesses of the word-skills approach, however, the solution to the problem of beginning reading instruction in ESL is not, as seems to have been the intention of Connelly and Sims (1982), to replace it with a version of the reading skills approach which pays no attention to the development of the

students' linguistic knowledge. A more adequate solution is a synthesis of the reading skills and a richer *language skills approach* which focuses on syntax as well as vocabulary and morphology. I will base my argument for such an approach and for materials to implement it on a consideration of a concept central to Goodman's (1967) view of the reading process, namely the concept of prediction or expectation.

EXPECTATIONS IN READING

Much of the scholarship in the general area of ESL reading in the past decade has associated itself more or less closely with Goodman's conceptualization of the reading process as a "psycholinguistic guessing game" (Eskey, 1973; Clarke and Silberstein, 1977; Coady, 1979; Devine, 1983; Davidson, 1983). Behind the Goodman description lies a view of reading as an activity in which the reader is constantly forming, testing, rejecting, accepting, and revising hypotheses about different aspects of the text on the basis of a sampling of textual clues. It is on the formation of such hypotheses, the expectations of the title of this article, that I now wish to focus attention.

An efficient reader, Goodman argues, is a risk-taker who has the ability to form expectations about what may or may not follow in the text. There is evidence from research employing miscue analysis that the formation of such expectations is part of the reading process for native speakers (Goodman and Goodman, 1982). Their existence is also open to confirmation by introspection and self-observation, most clearly so in cases where expectations are not fulfilled. Consider the following paragraph and the six possibilities (a–f) for its acceptable conclusion:

Example 1.

> The evening at the expensive French restaurant which we had looked forward to so much turned out to be an unmitigated disaster. First, we lost our way and drove around for an hour before we found the restaurant. Then we found ourselves sitting at a table beside the door to the kitchen and being served by an extremely surly waiter. Finally. . . .
>
> a) we were not able to find anything remotely resembling a French dish on the menu.
> b) our meal, when we finally got it, was reheated and tasted awful.
> c) the bill came to an outrageous $20.
> d) the menu did not contain any of the spaghetti, linguine, or cannelloni dishes we like so much.
> e) Volkswagen had just announced a $900 rebate on 1983 Rabbits.
> f) the band was magnificent.

I would argue that possibilities (a) and (b) could be read as immediately acceptable conclusions to this paragraph. Possibilities (c), (d), (e), and (f), however, have a jarring effect on readers because they cannot immediately or easily be reconciled with expectations which have been formed, but which, until the reading of these possibilities, have remained in the readers' unconscious minds. As I discuss below, usually an attempt is made to resolve the apparent anomaly. But the reaction of surprise which most readers will feel on reading (c), (d), (e), or (f) makes it clear not only that we are capable of forming expectations but also that we make use of this ability while we read.

What kind of knowledge enables readers to generate such expectations?

Clearly, the first requirement is an accurate semantic interpretation of the linguistic forms which make up the part of the text which has already been read. Equally clearly, however, the linguistic competence which allows readers to generate accurate interpretations is by no means sufficient for them to make the predictions on which their judgments for acceptable conclusions to Example 1 are based. Background knowledge of the world, some of it general, some of it specific, is needed to make such predictions.

Research in language processing and artificial intelligence has been attempting to specify this knowledge, using such terms as *frames* (Minsky, 1975), or *scripts* (Schank and Abelson, 1977), or *schemata* (Becker, 1973) and has inspired some recent research in ESL (Johnson, 1982; Carrell, 1983). Such knowledge equips readers to expect something like (a) or (b) in Example 1, either of which is processed without difficulty. Possibilities (c) through (f) are much more problematic. Note, however, that readers appear to be able to suspend disbelief in the coherence of a text and appear to possess an *accommodation mechanism* through which an attempt is made to integrate an unexpected development (any of Possibilities (c) through (f) again) into their representation of the text. Often this is accomplished through the construction by readers of elaborate assumptions, which might be seen as more sophisticated versions of the "bridging assumptions" of Clark and Haviland (1974, 1977). Thus Possibility (e), for example, might be integrated with the rest of the text through the assumption that the writer had just purchased a VW Rabbit before the announcement of the rebate and was thinking of the unnecessary expenditure of $900. Other unexpected possibilities, for example (f), are even more difficult to integrate into the rest of the text. However, the fact that readers make attempts to reconcile unexpected text developments with the rest of the text is something to be borne in mind. Its pedagogical implications will be discussed in the section on expectation exercises.

If we now leave the subject of the readers' knowledge of the world and return to the topic of their linguistic knowledge, we can recognize that the process of forming expectations during reading does not merely concern the generation of predictions about what may follow semantically or rhetorically. It will become clear, in fact, that readers generate a set of expectations for the linguistic forms which may occur in the text. As an illustration of this point, consider the following two examples:

Example 2.

I went to a baseball game last night. It was damp and cold, and the stadium was almost empty. I think the weather discouraged . . .

a) people.
b) ø
c) the fans from coming to the game.
d) lots of people to come to the game.
e) people to stay at home.

Example 3.

In this part of town . . .

a) has a lot of good, inexpensive restaurants.
b) students can usually find decent apartments.
c) there are many new apartment buildings.
d) is very popular among students.

If Example 2 were to finish with (b), (d), or (e), native speakers would be surprised, their expectations confounded, and their comprehension halted, at least temporarily. Their knowledge of the syntactic properties of *discourage* leads them to expect at least an object after the verb, thus ruling out (b) as an acceptable ending, or to expect an object, the preposition *from*, and the *-ing* form of a verb, thus ruling out (d) and (e). In addition, Possibility (e) is ruled out by the readers' knowledge of the semantic properties of *discourage*, namely that an action in its complementization must be the action not taken, rather than the action taken as an alternative.

After reading the introductory prepositional phrase in Example 3, native speaker readers would again have their expectations confounded by (a) or (d) as possible completions of the sentence. Their knowledge of syntax leads them to expect a subject sooner or later, but certainly before the occurrence of the main verb. Possibilities (b) and (c) are processed with no difficulty. Possibilities (a) and (d), on the other hand, cause the native speaker reader to halt, to think, and to make some kind of adjustment before perhaps going on to ascribe meaning to the sentence.

It seems, therefore, that we are capable of developing a second type of expectation while reading, expectations for linguistic form, and that our knowledge of grammar and vocabulary is the prerequisite to the development of such expectations. They are expectations which are doubtlessly generated at a different, less conscious level in our intellects than the level at which semantic expectations occur. But they are nonetheless real. However, the question remains whether they are a necessary part of the reading process or merely an intellectual trick which we can perform when called upon to do so.

Goodman and Goodman (1982) report on the miscues of a native speaker reader which show her choosing a linguistic structure which is grammatically reconcilable with the previously read portion of the text, but which is grammatically different from the structure which the writer of the text happened to choose. From such evidence, Goodman and Goodman conclude that readers predict the grammar as well as the meaning of a text.

Indications of the importance for reading of the generation of expectations for linguistic form are to be found in the reading behavior of beginning adult learners of ESL, in other words, in the reading behavior of those students whose linguistic knowledge is likely to be weakest. In his research with Spanish speaking learners of ESL, Clarke (1979, 1980) finds evidence that the transfer of effective reading strategies from native language reading (among them, according to Goodman's view of reading, the ability to generate expectations for semantic content) can be "short-circuited" by inadequate linguistic knowledge of English. Hatch (1974) mentions eye-fixation experiments with native and non-native speakers of English. While native speakers tended to concentrate on the content words of a text, beginning non-native speakers showed no such discrimination between content words and function words. This can be interpreted as an indication that the beginning readers in ESL, lacking the necessary linguistic knowledge, were unable to predict form and had to focus on it. By doing so, they had less time to focus on content words, to form a semantic representation for themselves of the text on the basis of which they could then generate expectations for what would follow. They were therefore inefficient readers.

From the discussion above, therefore, it can be argued that readers of ESL, particularly at the beginning level, are forced by their inadequate linguistic

competence into a certain, conscious preoccupation with questions of linguistic form, certainly on the levels of lexis and syntax, possibly, but less so, on the level of morphology. Such a conscious preoccupation, instead of the swift and unconscious formation of expectations for form which characterizes efficient readers, puts great demands on ESL readers' mental capacities, including their short-term memory space. This in turn renders difficult or impossible the mobilization of other, non-linguistic knowledge which could allow reasonable predictions of semantic content to be integrated effectively into the reading process.

In summary, then, the examination of the concept of expectation has suggested the following:

i) Good readers use their linguistic knowledge to predict the grammatical forms which may occur in a text.
ii) Good readers also use their knowledge of rhetoric and of the world to make predictions about the semantic content of a text.
iii) If readers cannot do (i), they will not be able to consistently do (ii).

The generation of expectations for form is clearly not sufficient for good reading to take place; that has been demonstrated by the discussion of how essential world knowledge is for the ultimate formation of semantic expectations. However, generating expectations for form is a necessary part of the reading process. Therefore the task of enabling students to develop the ability to generate such expectations deserves our attention, especially during the early stages of ESL reading instruction.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING BEGINNING READING IN ESL

This examination of the nature of expectations and their role in the reading process suggests that one goal of reading instruction is to bring students to a point where they are generating and using expectations for text in more or less the same way as efficient native speaker readers do (cf. Oller's "expectancy hypothesis" (1983)). It also suggests that anything which can preempt the formation of such expectations is not conducive to effective reading instruction. So, for example, asking students to read a text the syntax and lexis of which are far beyond the students' linguistic competence is a poor instructional strategy in reading because it will prevent the expectation formation process.

From this, it might be concluded that beginning ESL instruction should focus solely on the development of the linguistic skills necessary for reading. However, I would agree with Been (1975), who sees that learning of such skills as the goal of only one component in the reading program, that an exclusive focus on language skills is not indicated even for beginning students. The exclusive use of the language skills approach would mean that the reading program would have three of the four weaknesses which have been identified as present in the word skills approach, namely (i) the possibility that we will frustrate good readers by not giving them real reading tasks; (ii) the non-utilization of real reading as a communicative language activity which will provide additional input for further real language learning; and (iii) the probable fostering of a single-word strategy and of an undesirable general attitude to reading merely as a language learning exercise and not as a communication activity in its own right.

Instead of focusing exclusively on language skills, therefore, beginning reading instruction should have both a language skills and a reading skills component. In the

former, as has been shown necessary by the preceding discussion, systematic and explicit attention should be paid to sentential and intersentential syntax and to vocabulary development. In the latter, students would be given the opportunity of practicing different reading activities and mobilizing both language and reading skills in the pursuit of these activities.

A consideration of the notion of expectation, however, not only suggests the general organization of a beginning reading course. It also raises the specific possibility that prediction should be introduced into exercises in language and reading skills at this level. The unproven and untested assumption behind such exercises, of course, is that focused and conscious practice in the exercise of the skill of prediction will aid in the development of that skill and will enhance the chances of it being mobilized for real reading activities.

Anticipation exercises are not new to reading texts. But until now, they have only appeared in textbooks intended for intermediate and advanced learners of ESL, and they have focused almost exclusively on generating expectations for content with no attention to the development of language skills. Within the framework of a comprehensive reading course for adult beginning students of ESL, I have attempted to introduce prediction into language skill exercises which seek to teach students syntax and vocabulary as well as into reading skill exercises which give students a basic knowledge of English rhetoric and which encourage them to utilize this knowledge and their knowledge of the world. Examples of these exercises, all of which are being used with beginning students in the intensive ESL program of the English Language Institute at the University of Akron, are contained in the following section of this article. To date, student reaction to the exercises has been positive, though no objective evaluation of their effect on reading proficiency has been attempted. In the same section of the article, I have included comments on and discussion of the exercises.

Expectation Exercises

All of the exercise types illustrated here follow a multiple-choice format, perhaps giving them the appearance more of testing than of teaching activities. However, the character of these exercises as teaching-learning activities is reflected less in their format than in the way in which they are handled in the classroom. It is recommended that they be completed by students in a period of individually-paced work in the reading class. This allows the instructor to give feedback and guidance to students on an individual basis and helps ensure that such exercises are learning activities. Thus, if the exercises are testing exercises, they are so in a non-traditional sense, in that, given proper handling, they allow the students the opportunity to test and receive feedback on their own hypotheses about certain aspects of English texts.

Another reason for giving individual feedback is the possibility that the instructor will need to respond to unusual expectations on the part of students. In the discussion of the nature of semantic expectations, I demonstrated how, although a given textual development ran counter to expectations and was difficult to process, readers would strain to integrate the unexpected development into their representation of the text. We must assume that our students possess a similar accommodation mechanism for texts in their first language, and that they may therefore in some exercises make expectation choices which are relatively low on the probability scale but which are plausible, provided some other assumptions are made. Individual

attention from the instructor should be able to establish if a student's unusual choice in an expectation task is due to the exercising of the accommodation mechanism or to genuine misunderstanding.

An assumption in all the exercises is that the students are familiar with the non-target vocabulary used in the exercises, and that they have had some explicit instruction in the target vocabulary items or the syntactic or rhetorical points which are the focus of a given exercise.

Syntax. The exercises in this section focus on a number of aspects of sentential syntax. An objective common to all of them, however, is to develop in students the ability to orient themselves within a sentence by identifying subject and main verb. Experience has shown that an inability to perform this task can pose reading problem for students, but that, when attention is paid to it, beginning students can quickly learn to handle sentences with complex noun phrase subjects.

Exercise 1 is intended to develop differentiated expectations about what may follow subject NP's and sentence-initial NP's inside prepositional phrases. It may also encourage beginning students to read in phrases rather than words, though this is not its primary purpose.

Exercise 1.

Instructions: How can the sentence continue? In these examples, read the beginning of each sentence. Then choose the correct possibility or possibilities for the later part of the sentences.

1. This part of town
   a) there are comfortable apartments.
   b) has a lot of apartment buildings.
   c) is really beautiful in spring and summer.
   d) live a lot of college students.
2. In this part of town,
   a) has a lot of good, inexpensive restaurants.
   b) students can usually find decent apartments.
   c) there are many new apartment buildings.
   d) is very popular among students.

Exercise 2 is designed to develop expectations for what can follow an initial determiner and head noun and to develop flexible expectations for the character of noun phrases (simple or with postmodifying prepositional phrases or relative clauses). Exercise 3 is intended to develop expectations for what follows complex NP's. Note that the inclusion of Possibility (d) will make the exercise less mechanical. It introduces, however, the additional element of acceptable subject-verb collocations.

Exercise 2.

Instructions: How can the sentence continue? In these examples, read the beginning of each sentence. Then choose the correct possibility or possibilities for the later part of the sentences.

1. The film
   a) was really enjoyable.
   b) in the Student Center starts at 8 o'clock tonight.
   c) which we saw on television last night.
   d) which we saw last night was very good.

Exercise 3.

Instructions: How can the sentence continue? In these examples, read the beginning of each sentence. Then choose the correct possibility or possibilities for the later part of the sentence.

1. The car which Ali bought last week
   a) broke down yesterday.
   b) which Carlos sold to him.
   c) uses a lot of gas.
   d) visited his friend.

Exercise 4 seeks to develop knowledge of the definite article and of its connection with restrictive relative clauses. With this knowledge, a reader can develop expectations for restricted relative clauses. Note that the exercise is contextualized and that, although the immediate objective is acquisition of linguistic competence, the exercise is similar to real reading in that the semantic content of the text must be understood to do the exercise successfully. Note also that 1(d) and 2(c) are unexpected possibilities on which some students might use their accommodation mechanism.

Exercise 4.

Instructions: Read the first sentence of each example. Then choose the sentence or sentences which could follow it. Each pair of sentences which you make must make good sense.

1. Mayumi and Maria looked at many apartments in the first week of the semester.
   a) The apartment cost $300 a month and was five minutes from the campus.
   b) The apartment which they finally rented was expensive, but it was near the campus.
   c) But a lot of the apartments were too expensive for them.
   d) The apartment which I rented last year was not comfortable.
2. There are many serious problems in some developing countries.
   a) One of the problems is that there is not enough work.
   b) The problem is that they don't have enough food for their people.
   c) The problem which I had with my car changed my plans.
   d) The problem which they have to solve first is the problem of feeding their people.

Vocabulary. These exercises are intended to help students learn vocabulary and to develop expectations based to a large extent on their vocabulary knowledge. Exercises 1 and 2 are examples of an uncontextualized and a contextualized exercise designed to develop expectations for what can be the object of a given verb. Similar exercises can be used for verb-subject selectional restrictions.

Exercise 1.

Instructions: Choose the things people could *improve*:

a) their English	e) their grades
b) the weather	f) their mistakes
c) their families	g) their problems
d) their pronunciation	h) their cooking

Exercise 2.

Instructions: Read each example. Then choose the phrase or phrases which you could use for the end of the last sentence of each example. You can often complete the sentence in different ways. Mark all the phrases which are possible.

In this state, too many people drive their cars after they drink alcohol. Often they have accidents and kill or injure other people. The state government is trying to *solve*

a) people who drink.
b) this problem.
c) the number of accidents.
d) the problem of drunk driving.
e) the people who get hurt.
f) the problem of poor medical care.
g) the state's money troubles.
h) the problem of people who drink and drive.

Exercise 3 allows students to think associatively, guided by a general topic. A follow-up possibility is to present to the students a paragraph about soccer and let them experience how accurate their lexical predictions were.

Exercise 3.

Instructions: You are going to read a paragraph about *soccer*. Choose all the words which you expect in the paragraph.

a) stadium
b) concert
c) game
d) to rent
e) team
f) ball
g) movies
h) audience
i) spectators
j) to lose

Exercises 4 and 5 combine the development of vocabulary knowledge with the exercising of students' capacities for recognizing logical connections. The logical connections are linguistically implicit in Exercise 4, and linguistically explicit in Exercise 5 through the use of discourse markers. The italicized words are the target vocabulary items for these exercises:

Exercise 4.

Instructions: Read the following examples. Then try to imagine the ideas which will perhaps follow. Choose the idea or ideas which are possible.

1. Last summer I traveled by *boat* from England to France in the middle of a bad *storm*.
   a) The sea was very *rough*, and I became sick.
   b) The water was very *calm*, and I really enjoyed the trip.
   c) The *waves* were very high, of course, but I enjoyed the trip.
2. No one could be *saved* from the boat which *sank* in the storm last week.
   a) The bad weather *prevented* lifeboats and helicopters from reaching the *ship*.
   b) The *survivors* were pulled out of the water by men of the Coast Guard.
   c) The sea *conditions* were the *worst* for many years, and the *ship* went down very fast.
   d) The Coast Guard found the *ship*, but there was no one on it.

Exercise 5.

Instructions: Read the first sentence of these examples. Then read the beginning of the second sentence. Then try to imagine the ideas which could follow. Choose all the possible ideas which you could expect in the second sentence.

1. The weather was very bad last weekend. *But* we
   a) got very cold and wet at the football game.
   b) enjoyed the football game a lot.
   c) did not have a good time at the football game which we saw.
   d) still had an enjoyable weekend with our friends.

Vocabulary and rhetoric. The one exercise in this section seeks both to teach vocabulary (italicized) and to give students a first idea of what they can expect rhetorically in an English paragraph, namely that the writer keeps the contract which is established with the readers to focus on one topic. Note that Possibilities (a), (d) and (f), though hardly disadvantages, might be integrated by students using their accommodation mechanisms, for example, by concession. Attention to individual student responses is therefore again seen to be necessary. A follow-up possibility for this type of exercise, as with Exercise 3 in the Vocabulary Section, is to have students read a real paragraph with the same topic and to let them compare the content of the paragraph with their own predictions. Feedback on their predictions could be delayed until the reading of the paragraph is completed.

1. Instructions: Read the first sentence in each example. This sentence gives the main idea of a paragraph which you are going to read. Think about the idea. Then choose all the other ideas which you could expect in the paragraph.

   But the airships of the 1920's and 1930's had a number of *disadvantages*.
   a) Airships could stay in the air for a long time.
   b) The gas in airships was dangerous; it could explode easily.
   c) It was difficult to control an airstrip in strong winds.
   d) Airships could carry more passengers than the planes of that time.
   e) Airships could not fly well in bad weather.
   f) Airships were faster than the passenger ships which crossed the Atlantic.

CONCLUSION

This examination of the nature and role of expectations in reading has suggested that both a reading skills and a language skills component are necessary in a program of reading instruction for adult beginning ESL students. In addition, the examination has suggested directions for the development of reading exercises specifically designed to teach syntax, vocabulary, and rhetoric and to encourage the formation and use of expectations by readers of ESL. Initial experience with these exercises and feedback from both instructors and students indicate that students find them a meaningful and enjoyable learning activity. Any objective pedagogic assessment of the exercises and of the approach on which they are based will, of course, necessitate a more rigorous testing of their effectiveness in ESL reading instruction. Until such an assessment is available, however, individual ESL

instructors who believe that expectation formation may benefit their students may wish to develop their own expectation-oriented exercises and, in doing so, add to the quality and quantity of the exercise types outlined in this article.

REFERENCES

Baudoin, E. Margaret, Ellen S. Bober, Mark A. Clarke, Barbara K. Dobson, and Sandra Silberstein. 1977. *Reader's choice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Becker, Joseph D. 1973. A model for the encoding of experiential information. In *Computer models of thought and language*, Roger Schank and Kenneth Colby (Eds.), 396-434. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Been, Shelia. 1975. Reading and the foreign language teaching program. *TESOL Quarterly* 9(3):233-242.

Carrell, Patricia L. 1983. Some issues in studying the role of schemata or background knowledge in second language comprehension. Paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983.

Clark, Herbert H., and Susan E. Haviland. 1974. Psychological processes as linguistic explanation. In *Explaining linguistic phenomena*, David Cohen (Ed.), 91-124. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing.

Clark, Herbert H., and Susan E. Haviland. 1977. Comprehension and the given-new contract. In *Discourse production and comprehension*, Roy O. Freedle (Ed.), 1-40. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

Clarke, Mark A. 1979. Reading in Spanish and English: evidence from adult ESL students. *Language Learning* 29(1):121-150.

Clarke, Mark A. 1980. The short-circuit hypothesis of ESL reading - or when language competence interferes with reading performance. *Modern Language Journal* 64(2): 203-209.

Clarke, Mark A., and Sandra Silberstein. 1977. Toward a realization of psycholinguistic principles in the ESL reading class. *Language Learning* 27(1):135-154.

Coady, James. 1979. A psycholinguistic model of the ESL reader. In *Reading in a second language*, Ronald Mackay, Bruce Barkman, and R.R. Jordan (Eds.), 5-12. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Connelly, Michael, and Jean Sims. 1982. *Time and space: a basic reader*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Davidson, Fred. 1983. A three-stage reading skills syllabus. Paper presented at 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983.

Devine, Joanne. 1983. ESL readers' internalized models of the reading process. Paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983. (See this volume p 95 ff. Eds. note).

Dubin, Fraida, and Elite Olshtain. 1981. *Reading by all means*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Eskey, David E. 1973. A model program for teaching advanced reading to students of English as a foreign language. *Language Learning* 23(2):169-184.

Goodman, Kenneth S. 1967. Reading: a psycholinguistic guessing game. In *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, Harry Singer and Robert B. Ruddell (Eds.), 259-271. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Goodman, Kenneth S., and Yetta M. Goodman. 1982. Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analyzing oral reading. In *Readings in applied English linguistics* (3rd ed.), Harold B. Allen and Michael D. Linn (Eds.), 372-387. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Hamp-Lyons, Elizabeth. 1982. Review article on seven advanced ESL reading texts. *TESOL Quarterly* 16(2):253-262.

Hatch, Evelyn M. 1974. Research on reading a second language. *Journal of Reading Behavior* 6(1):53-61.

Johnson, Patricia. 1982. Effects of reading comprehension of building background knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly* 16(4):503 516.

Long, Michael H., Wendy Allen, Andre Cyr, Carol Pomeroy, Ellen Ricard, Nina Spada, and Phyllis Vogel. 1980. *Reading English for academic study*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Minsky, Marvin, 1975. A framework for representing knowledge. In *The psychology of computer vision*, Patrick H. Winston (Ed.), 211-280. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oller, John W. Jr. 1983. Story writing principles and ESL teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 17(1):39 54.

Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sonka, Amy L. 1980. *Skillful reading*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Zukowski/Faust, Jean, Susan P. Johnston, Clark Atkinson, and Elizabeth Templin. 1982. *In context*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.